

Grant S-M.

Parade's End: A Sesquicentennial Snapshot of Civil War Soldiers, Civilians and Veterans.

***American Nineteenth Century History* 2015, 16(3), 297-306.**

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *American Nineteenth Century History* on September 2015, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/14664658.2015.1130321>

DOI link to article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2015.1130321>

Date deposited:

08/06/2016

Embargo release date:

01 March 2017



This work is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Parade's End: A Sesquicentennial Snapshot of Civil War Soldiers, Civilians and Veterans

A Broken Regiment: The 16th Connecticut's Civil War

LESLEY J. GORDON

Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014

Pp. xiii + 379, \$49.95 (hbk, pdf, epub and mobi), ISBNs 978 0 8071 5730 5, 978 0 8071 5731 2, 978 0 8071 5732 9, 978 0 8071 5733 6.

Across the Bloody Chasm: The Culture of Commemoration among Civil War Veterans

M. KEITH HARRIS

Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014

Pp. xi + 220, \$PRICE? ISBN 978 0 8071 5772 5.

Across the Divide: Union Soldiers View the Northern Home Front

STEVEN J. RAMOLD

New York: New York University Press, 2013

Pp. 256, £35.00 (hbk), ISBN 978 0 8147 2919 9.

Soldiering for Freedom: How the Union Army Recruited, Trained, and Deployed the U.S. Colored Troops

BOB LUKE and JOHN DAVID SMITH

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014

Pp. x + 132, \$PRICE? ISBN 978 1 4214 1360 0 (hbk), 1 4214 1360 4 (pbk).

-----0-----

By the time of reading, the Civil War sesquicentennial will be over. At the time of writing, it is just drawing to a close, and already it, like the war it commemorated, has become the subject of debate and discussion, introspection and inquiry, and contrast and comparison with the war's centennial commemoration. The centennial, of course, took place against a backdrop of increasing racial tension and civil rights activism in a nation for whom the Civil War's political and social legacy, in the 1960s, remained raw, while its military one faced a mounting challenge in Southeast Asia. War has not ceased, of course. And the sesquicentennial has taken place in an even more complicated conflict climate: in the long twilight of a terrorist atrocity that changed the American nation's perspective on war entirely, and in the wider context of the European commemoration of the First World War, with which it just overlaps. It is an opportune time therefore to consider how a war fought 150 years ago

retains its hold not just on the academy but on public and popular consciousness. And the four works under consideration here offer a valuable starting point in this regard, exploring as they do, respectively, the experiences of one particularly ill-starred northern regiment, the sometimes strained relationship between battlefield and home-front, the “culture of commemoration” that emerged in the later nineteenth century, and the particular experiences of African American troops.

None of these works traces an especially uplifting trajectory through the Civil War and its aftermath. This in itself reveals a great deal about the current tone of much Civil War scholarship, which has replaced the grand narrative driven by emancipation and Union victory (or, indeed, Confederate defeat) with a rather more reflective emphasis on the human cost of the war. And the story that Lesley Gordon expertly traces in *A Broken Regiment* provides one of the best examples of this, focusing as it does on a regiment whose surviving members effectively transformed a war-time record of failure into a commemorative tradition of success.

In order to track the evolution of the story of the 16th Connecticut, Gordon does more than simply draw out one regiment’s history from the profusion and confusion of the Civil War’s military and personal records. Instead, she adopts a microhistory approach, and stresses that her focus is on the enlisted men, “individuals thrown together by war and crisis, grappling over questions of military service, manhood, emancipation, race, cowardice, heroism, and the war’s larger meaning” (p. 4). In the process, she makes a strong and persuasive case for the deployment by historians of a much-maligned, and consequently too often ignored, body of source material: regimental histories. She challenges the widespread reluctance among academic historians to “write or even consult regimental histories,” and argues, plausibly, that since the infantry regiment constituted the “basic ‘building block’ of the armies” it was, therefore, “an essential source of identity for most Civil War soldiers,”

and its published history a “fruitful way of thinking about and exploring war and its lasting impact” (p.3). For graduate students and faculty alike, Gordon’s assertion of the validity and value of the regimental history —and the evidence of what she has achieved through judicious use of such source material—will be encouraging. Too long spoiled for choice by the sheer embarrassment of recorded riches that the Civil War provided, many historians have turned up their nose at what was right under it. *A Broken Regiment* shows us how much we may have missed.

Raised, as many regiments were, with greater speed than preparation, the 16th Connecticut did not cover itself in glory when it first took to the field. That the field in question was Antietam partly explained, but for contemporaries certainly did not excuse, the fact that the regiment broke rank and fled the battle. Less than two years later, the regiment was captured, almost to a man, and confined in perhaps the most notorious Confederate prison camp, Andersonville, where over a third of the men died. What remained of the 16th Connecticut limped home at the war’s end, “physically and emotionally broken,” Gordon notes, “from the trials of war and imprisonment.” What interests Gordon, however, is not primarily the story of the 16th Connecticut’s trials, but the regiment’s ultimate triumph in writing itself into the narrative of Union victory. What fascinates her, and is certain to engage any reader of this excellent work, are the efforts undertaken by the survivors of the regiment to locate themselves in that larger, patriotic, national narrative, in effect “to commemorate a different past than the one they experienced” (p.9). “They wanted an unambiguous story told and remembered about themselves,” she observes, one “free of anything embarrassing, unmanly, or dishonourable,” a story “that would endure for generations. They wanted,” in short, “to be whole again” (p.2).

The process of their disintegration, of course, began on the home-front, although they hardly realized that at the time. Despite its antebellum flirtation with “Know Nothing”

politics, and its powerful war-time Democratic influences, Connecticut in 1862, the year in which the 16th Connecticut was mustered into service, was in the grip of a “heightened martialism” that for many of its young male residents conjoined the possibilities of proving their patriotism with securing both peer approval and a financial profit in the form of the generous bounties offered to those who volunteered (p.12). And, for the men of the 16th Connecticut, as was common for many Civil War soldiers, joining the Union army did not mean leaving home behind entirely. They signed up along with friends and family, and in a very real sense took their community, along with its antebellum expectations about valor and victory with them as they marched off to war; expectations that could hardly be sustained on the battlefield.

Trapped between the combination of scrutiny, support and censure directed at them by their home communities, and by a newly-formed military machine that regarded most rank and file soldiers as “potential deserters,” many Civil War regiments faltered in their first few months in the field (p.34). And this was especially the case for the 16th Connecticut. The regiment did not see much of the war, although as Gordon argues, it was what they did see, the Battle of Antietam in September, 1862, that “forever defined the regiment” (p.26). Not that this was immediately apparent. Initial reports from the field gave no indication of the confusion upon it, although private letters home often told a very different story from the one that the local papers printed. And when the private accounts began to overlap with and inform the public ones, the emphasis was as much on the lack of support afforded the 16th Connecticut as it was on any particular shortcomings within the regiment. Indeed, one of the most fascinating aspects of Gordon’s research is the way that she has delineated the uneasy, and in many cases unsuccessful transition from citizen to soldier within this regiment, whose men “openly balked at their commanders, complained loudly about lack of pay, and claimed that they had never been properly mustered into service.” And whilst critical of those still at

home who refused to serve, the 16th Connecticut “rarely expressed open support for the war’s high ideals” and even burned its own camp at Plymouth, North Carolina: “an act of bravado and defiance,” as Gordon interprets it, “by men refusing to accept their lot as restricted soldiers rather than autonomous citizens” (p. 117).

The rehabilitation of the 16th Connecticut, at least as far as its members’ role as citizen-soldiers was concerned, derived not from conflict but from confinement in Andersonville following the capture of most of the regiment at Plymouth. At the war’s end, four of the regiment offered testimony against the camp’s commandant, Henry Wirz in his much-publicized trial, thereby firmly establishing their own and their comrades’ credentials as soldiers who had suffered in the name of the nation. Its individual soldiers may have consistently downplayed Union ideals, as far as both emancipation and citizen-soldier service were concerned, but in the years after the war the reputation of the 16th Connecticut was located within “a new redemption narrative” that highlighted its courage and downplayed its sometimes questionable commitment to the Union, to the cause, and to comrades in other regiments (p. 206). In this respect, Gordon explains, the regimental colors proved a potent symbol, one around which an almost entirely heroic narrative could be woven, to be repeated and embellished in public and in print over the years that followed, and into the twentieth century. In 1907, the message was reinforced when a statue, “Andersonville Boy,” was unveiled at the site of the notorious camp. An emotive symbol of the innocence that had gone to war and the tragic experience that many troops brought home with them, for the 16th Connecticut the statue was perhaps an ambiguous symbol at best of youthful martial ideals and their less idealistic, adult incarnations.

Although it is always tempting to describe any regiment’s first engagement as a form of baptism by fire, Gordon has complicated this glib cliché with her emphasis on one regiment whose members did not emerge from the fire as the heroic warriors of legend. In

that respect they lived up neither to their own expectations nor those of the home-front. And as Gordon tells it, it was the road to the battlefield that may have been more decisive than battle itself as far as the 16th Connecticut's later actions and negative attitudes were concerned. Unlike those regiments raised at the start of the war, the 16th Connecticut had to negotiate a landscape already scarred by battle, evidenced by corpses by the roadside and briefly glimpsed, horrifying *tableaux vivants* of surgeons amputating limbs. And the awareness that this was a road that took the soldier far from home in a psychological as much as a physical sense already figured in many soldiers' reactions to such "sights and sounds of war" as they encountered. "You in Hartford," one wrote, long before the full horrors of that war, its battles and its prison camps, had impacted the 16th Connecticut "have no idea of what war is, or of the life of a soldier" (p. 29).

This perspective finds its echo in the opening sentence of Steven Ramold's work. Quoting a Wisconsin private's opinion that those "up North do not know what war is," Ramold proposes that this was the belief of "many Union soldiers during the Civil War." Union volunteers, he suggests, were men "who held views of their own families, communities, and home states that defy the traditional picture of unity based on their perception that civilians did not comprehend what it meant to be a Union soldier." Indeed, in his detailing of Union soldiers' "disgruntlement," and their sense of "lack of support, whether real or imagined," Ramold might well be describing the 16th Connecticut (p. 1). Yet where Gordon highlighted the unwillingness of members of the 16th Connecticut to accept the constraints of the citizen-soldier identity, Ramold suggests that much of the apparent dissociation from the home-front was, at least in part, an attempt to assert that new identity. When Union volunteers "grumbled that civilians did not recognize that soldiers had a different mindset and separate priorities than those unfamiliar with military life," Ramold argues, they were, at least to some degree, attempting to align themselves with the military

life, a life that, after all, the vast majority of Union recruits had no knowledge of prior to 1861. Union soldiers, Ramold emphasises, swiftly realized that “they were members of a separate army community,” whose survival was linked with that of the nation itself (pp. 2-3). In effect, the gulf between home and battlefield was as much of a martial necessity as it was a reflection of misunderstandings and erroneous assumptions on both sides.

Nevertheless, there were misunderstandings on both sides, and *Across the Divide* seeks to probe the implications of many of these in order to nuance the relationship between home and battlefield and complicate our appreciation of the personal and the political ramifications of the Civil War. Somewhat disconcertingly, however, Ramold works backwards in this study, with much of his initial evidence and argument derived from the veterans’ perspective, and the widespread suspicion that soldiering, as New England Minister Theodore Parker had proposed several decades before in the context Mexican War, was hardly a suitable basis for citizenship, and indeed rendered the veteran “a curse to society and a shame to the mother that bore him.”¹ Ramold quotes one veteran who feared that he “would be lost in civil life,” and another who expressed his “dread of being a citizen” (p. 9). And both these examples, along with many others, make the point clearly enough, but it is not an uncontentious point, and merited being located in its historiographical context perhaps just a little more clearly.

It has become a given in the twenty-first century that both front-line troops and military support personnel returning from combat are susceptible to all manner of post-combat stresses and strains, but this was not, Parker’s suspicions about the deleterious effects of combat on the individual notwithstanding, a given in the Civil War era, and for a long time not a given among those who studied Civil War troops. Even now, neither Eric Dean’s emphasis on Civil War soldiers’ “alienation from all that is normal, civil and decent,” nor Earl Hess’s argument that the war’s “survivors found themselves set apart from other people,

even those closest to them,” are universally accepted as definitive explanations of how the majority of Civil War soldiers and veterans felt, even if some of them, clearly, did feel both alienated and alone. Close studies of individual communities, such as Nicole Etcheson’s work on Putnam County, Indiana, suggest that although civilians “may never have understood what the young men they sent to war experienced,” nevertheless, as Etcheson found, no “surmountable rift” was detectable between home-front and battlefield, at least not in Putnam County.²

The point may be impossible to prove, since, as James Marten has stressed in his study of veterans in post-war America, as yet “we know little about the interior lives of veterans.” And there are some aspects of those interior lives that will remain forever opaque. Ramold, however, is confident enough to draw some conclusions from what evidence does exist, and asserts, in an echo of Parker’s gloomy suspicions, that one “indicator of changing and hardening attitudes among veterans was their declining acceptance of traditional social mores,” as if both the mores themselves and the form of deviation from them were both consistent and widespread (p. 9). Similarly, his proposal that one of the most striking examples of this “was the soldier’s casual acceptance of violence and death” is a more problematic one than it might seem. Mark Schantz has, of course, argued that the Civil War generation was educated toward eternity in ways that our more secular age cannot readily comprehend. At the same time, Drew Gilpin Faust’s study, *This Republic of Suffering*, in its title alone suggests that death on the scale that the Civil War produced was not something soldiers or civilians ever found easy to accept. Certainly, Civil War soldiers’ letters, as Ramold notes, often stated that the sight of corpses elicited no reaction in the writer; but the proximity of death produced reaction enough that the soldier felt it important enough to mention in a letter home.³

Ramold is attuned to the problems of evidence, of course, and to the dangers of taking at face value the sentiments expressed in either private letters or the contemporary press. Although the Civil War generation left a wealth of documented evidence behind it for historians to pore over, it is not an unproblematic cache of clues to the opinions and perspectives of the time. Further, historians have not, as Gordon's study showed, always taken full advantage of these riches nor, as Ramold's work suggests, deployed them in the direction of Union army opinion on the home-front. And once he moves away from some of his rather more contentious assertions about how Union troops felt and the effects of combat upon them, Ramold is on surer ground in his delineation and analysis of how many soldiers responded, during the war itself, to the problems of conscription and draft opposition, emancipation and the wider meaning of the war, and the political upheavals on the home-front. He stresses how "ill-defined" the enemy was for Union troops, indeed how ill-defined the imperative to join up in the first place was, and explores how the many changes that the war produced, in terms both of the gender and racial divide, did little to define the war any more clearly for those troops on the front-line (p. 31). Attempting to retain control of the home from the distance of the battlefield, Union soldiers were not necessarily best located to understand the ways in which the war was recalibrating the antebellum domestic landscape. Unhappy at not being able to provide for their families as they felt they ought, many soldiers were nevertheless unwilling to grant their wives the financial and practical autonomy needed for survival on the home-front.

By far the biggest issue for Union troops was, of course, emancipation, a subject that caused ructions in many regiments. Ramold identifies three "broad categories" of opinion within the Union Army: put simply, those who strongly supported abolition, those who equally strongly opposed it, and the rest. And on that indecisive middle ground opinions shifted and changed "both progressively and regressively, based upon personal experience

and individual ideology” (p. 61). Where they may not have changed as much as some historians have suggested, according to Ramold, was in respect of the United States Colored Troops (USCT), whose regiments, he finds, “were never able to overcome the opposition of the anti-abolitionists of the Union Army” (p. 85) In the end, however, Ramold argues, it was upon the emancipationist “middle ground” that many Union troops took their stand, secure in the belief that emancipation was a necessary step toward defeating the Confederacy and securing the Union.

Overall, indeed, the picture that Ramold paints in this nuanced and detailed study, grounded as it is in a wealth of research in personal papers, is very much of men on the middle ground, men caught between North and South, slavery and emancipation, the home-front and the battlefield, and voluntarism and violence. Their perspective, on gender norms or emancipation, conscription or Copperheads, Republicans or Democrats, often shifted as the war progressed, and was susceptible of a confusion that stemmed from the inevitable disconnect between home and battlefield, but was fundamentally that of individuals who found themselves in a wholly new world of citizen-service. This was a world of hitherto only ill-defined expectations on the part of the home-front as to how much the individual owed the community and the nation; and equally ill-defined, but growing expectations on the part of the battlefield as to how much the community and the nation owed the individual. Because although most of the Union’s volunteer soldiers came from a civilian culture long attuned to a suspicion of military power, in joining up to fight for that Union they had crossed the divide of Ramold’s title, and found themselves contemplating questions of power and of politics, of loyalty and disloyalty, voluntarism and coercion, civilian authority and military force from an entirely new angle.

This fundamental division “between the army and civilian realms” became most obvious, Ramold suggests, during the election of 1864, when Union soldiers simultaneously

took part in a political debate that they realized was moot unless they also achieved military victory (p. 159). And in the process of seeking to secure that victory, many Union soldiers did feel that the civilian communities they had left behind, albeit temporarily, were not always as supportive as they should have been, nor as understanding as they might have been. In part, but only in part, this was an inevitable assertion of the new, martial identity that the volunteer had adopted. In larger part, as Ramold shows, it derived from the divide between home and battlefield: if civilians at home had little real idea of what front-line conditions were like, Union troops, in their turn, swiftly lost sight of the realities of the home-front. The most valuable contribution of Ramold's study, indeed, is its emphasis on this mutuality of misunderstanding, its reminder that the soldier's perspective needs to be balanced against that of the civilian in order for us to understand fully the ramifications of the Union war.

Once Union troops returned home, Ramold concludes, the necessities of transitioning back into civilian life did much to disguise, if not entirely heal, the war-time divide. Peace, he argues, "brought about a reconciliation and reconnection between those separated by distance and military service," although the reader may be left wondering, given where this study began, how effective this was for those who struggled to leave the war behind, physically and psychologically (p.171). And for many Civil War soldiers, Union and Confederate, the desire to paper over the divisions, between home and battlefield and between North and South was tempered by an even stronger imperative not to forget by constructing a culture of commemoration that served to sustain, in some respects, the divisions between civilian and soldier that the Civil War had produced. This is the subject of M. Keith Harris's study, *Across the Bloody Chasm*, that challenges the "reconciliation premise" that has for so long determined but, he charges, also distorted, our understanding of the commemorative imperative in the decades following the Civil War. Seeking, through close reading of private and published memoirs as well as the pages of publications such as *Confederate Veteran*, to

identify the dominant themes and direction of Civil War commemoration, Harris's findings reinforce Caroline Janney's recent argument concerning the limits of reconciliation in post-war America, and what she termed the "lingering acrimony" that informed sectional relations well into the twentieth century. There is rather more of a degree of forgiveness in Harris's study, certainly, but not much forgetting.⁴

What Harris has identified and examined is, in effect, a process of creation, or perhaps replication is a better term, by Civil War veterans of a quasi-military organizational structure within which they could meet, record, discuss and, above all, interpret for non-combatants and for future generations the war they had experienced. Yet this remained a sectional process, underscored by bitterness and blame, not least in regard to what Harris terms the "atrocities narrative," or veterans' emphasis on the suffering they had experienced in prisoner-of-war (POW) camps as well as the violence meted out to civilians during the war. The POW narrative was, Harris finds, one of the earliest and most contentious component of the commemorative culture, with Andersonville, where the 16th Connecticut found itself, inevitably, featuring prominently in many veterans' memoirs. Unlike Gordon, however, Harris interprets the POW narrative less as a means of reminding the nation of the sacrifices of the Civil War generation and more of a moral lesson in the art of war that set veterans apart from "nonveteran citizens" as the nineteenth century drew to a close. Veterans continued to make "sweeping claims against the enemy" as a means of reinforcing distinct sectional ideologies, but they did so in a cultural climate that, increasingly, sought to displace "the divisive issues at the heart of the conflict in favour of a teleological story of national progress" (p. 41).

As Harris describes it, however, Union veterans' version of the Civil War fit better into this national, and nationalist narrative than that of the "unrepentant Rebels" south of the Mason-Dixon line. With their emphasis firmly on the value of the Union, northern veterans,

as Earl Hess argued several years ago now, aligned victory with virtue, whilst their Confederate counterparts continued with “commemorative forms” that were “laden with confrontational language” (p. 89)⁵ And yet although the persistence of this increasingly muted but nevertheless potent mutual antipathy is cogently analysed in this study, the ways in which race played out in the commemorative culture is rather less assured. On the one hand, Harris argues that the “reconciliation premise,” the emphasis on reconciliation as achieved via a “white only” commemorative narrative, “is of limited utility” to our understanding of the veterans’ perspective. On the other, he reminds us that Civil War veterans “were working within a broader national commemorative experience” quite consciously constructed to “establish distance from past discord and instead illuminate modernity and unity” (pp.6-7). But since so much of that “past discord,” from Jamestown onwards, related to race, it might have been productive had Harris offered some further thoughts on the relationship between the culture of commemoration and its wider cultural context.

By the later nineteenth century, the Civil War’s cultural meaning had surely shifted away from a predominantly sectional narrative. One thinks of Union veteran Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., for example, who by 1895 was effectively preaching reconciliation by suggesting that Confederate troops “held just as sacred convictions” as Union ones, and merited the respect due “those who give all for their belief.” But one thinks, too, of Holmes’ former comrade, the abolitionist Pen Hallowell, who warned against dwelling over much “upon the virtues of our old friends, the enemy,” and falling victim to “the sentimental sophistry” that separated battlefield bravery from the beliefs that led to the battlefield in the first place. “To ignore the irreconcilable distinction between the cause of the North and that of the South,” Hallowell argued, “is to degrade the war to the level of a mere fratricidal strife for the display of military prowess and strength.”⁶ Those irreconcilable distinctions, of course, never really dissipated, and Harris ends his work with a brief but pertinent discussion

of the several ways in which the veterans' commemorative culture continues to inform current debate over, for example, the validity of placing a statue of Abraham Lincoln and his son, Tad, at the site of the Tredegar Iron Works in Richmond or, most contentiously, the flying of the Confederate flag at statehouses in the South.

In the, often heated, debates surrounding these cases, Harris observes, it is noticeable that "it is not the issue of slavery, but the issue of treason that has faded from the battle over Civil War memory" (p. 143). And Bob Juke and John David Smith's short study, *Soldiering for Freedom*, although a rather different work from the three discussed so far, reinforces this point. Because this brief book, one that is nevertheless packed with information, appears as part of a series entitled "How Things Worked," and that includes, among others, volumes on the immigration experience and on the Wall Street Crash. The series' title may be somewhat misleading, since this is not about things, *per se*, but about people; the people that created the American nation. In such a series, a discrete volume on African American Civil War troops speaks volumes about the significance that this subject, that these historical actors, are accorded not just in the Civil War narrative but in the larger story of America.

Aimed, one assumes, primarily at students, *Soldiering for Freedom* offers a succinct but nevertheless sophisticated introduction to the subject of racial discrimination in the Union Army. It opens, perhaps inevitably (but also, perhaps, slightly unimaginatively), with the example of Robert Gould Shaw and the famous attack on Fort Wagner by the Massachusetts 54th, before covering the history of discrimination within the American military from the American Revolution onwards and the particular issues facing black troops, both free and former slaves and their white officers. Mixing individual stories with a broader narrative, it usefully includes a chapter on recruitment and training, and does not neglect to discuss the subject of black sailors. The epilogue looks to the very difficult future that the former slaves faced not just socially and economically in the South but also in the army, where, the Army

Reorganization Act of 1866 notwithstanding, African Americans were consistently refused commissions. The book's guide to further reading provides a comprehensive discussion of the vast historiography associated with this topic.

Short books are frequently much harder to write than long ones. One has to select with care the material to include, the evidence to offer, the voices from the past that one is going to reintroduce to the present. *Soldiering for Freedom* has chosen its material well, but all of these works, in fact, are about similar choices, about the selective nature of memory and of meaning; questions that the Civil War sesquicentennial threw into sharp relief. What kind of story did the troops of the 16th Connecticut wish to tell? Not the reality of their battlefield initiation, certainly. They wished to be recognized for, even as they railed against, their temporary identities as citizen-soldiers of the Union. But when they returned home, the questions they faced, that all veterans faced, was how to reestablish social and personal relationships strained both by distance and experience and, in time, how to draw that experience into a coherent, commemorative narrative about the Civil War. They all, to use Gordon's phrase, "wanted to be whole again" (p. 2) And they wanted the Civil War story to be whole, too. They wanted it to be coherent, to offer closure. As the sesquicentennial draws to a close, these four works, in their respective ways, allow us to consider how that story has changed, and why closure may never be an option. They highlight the ways in which the historiographical focus has shifted from the battlefield to the home-front, from physical combat to psychological damage, and from sectional reconciliation to ongoing resistance and rancor that went beyond race. And in some senses, Harris's concluding discussion of the continuing conflicts over Civil War commemoration in the contemporary South sums up the significance of this particular story: the ongoing debate over whose past, whose perspective is chosen as the dominant narrative of the Civil War remains crucial, not just in terms of how Americans perceive the past, but how they locate themselves in the present.

S-M GRANT
Newcastle University

¹ Theodore Parker, "A Sermon of War," in *The Collected Works of Theodore Parker*, ed. Frances Power Cobbe, Vol. IV, *Discourses of Politics* (London, 1863) 17.

² Eric T. Dean, Jr., "'The Awful Shock and Rage of Battle': Rethinking the Meaning and Consequences of Combat in the American Civil War," *War in History*, 2001; 8 (2); 149-65, quotation at 154; Earl J Hess, *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997) 4, 20; Nicole Etcheson, *A Generation at War: The Civil War Era in a Northern Community* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2011) 147.

³ James Marten, *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011) 73; James I. Roberston, Jr., *Soldiers Blue and Gray* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988) 227; on this, see also Michael W. Schaefer, "'Really, Though, I'm Fine': Civil War Veterans and the Psychological Aftereffects of Killing," in Lawrence A. Kreiser, Jr. and Randal Allred (eds.), *The Civil War in Popular Culture: Memory and Meaning* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2013) 11-23; Mark S. Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country: The Civil War and America's Culture of Death* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008).

⁴ Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013) 6.

⁵ Earl J. Hess, *Liberty, Virtue, and Progress: Northerners and their War for the Union* (New York: New York University Press, 1988).

⁶ Quoted in Susan-Mary Grant, *Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.: Civil War Soldier, Supreme Court Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2015) 107.